

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 036397  
ORIGIN IO-14

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 OMB-01 SIG-02 AID-05 OIC-02  
EB-08 TRSE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 SP-02 L-03  
AGRE-00 USIA-15 COME-00 CU-06 OES-07 STR-07 /095 R

DRAFTED BY IO/IBC/BA:WMSOUTHWORTH:MZ  
APPROVED BY IO/IBC:RVHENNES  
OMB:MUSNICK

-----121310 110731Z /14

P R 102330Z FEB 78  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY  
INFO AMEMBASSY PARIS  
AMEMBASSY ROME  
AMEMBASSY VIENNA  
AMCONSUL MONTREAL  
USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

UNCLAS STATE 036397

ICAO, FODAG, NESCO, USIAEA, UNIDO

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: AORG

SUBJECT: GENEVA GROUP - MEETING OF EXPERTS ON PROGRAM  
ANALYSIS

REF: GENEVA 720

1. THERE FOLLOWS PROPOSED US PAPER FOR CITED MEETING.
2. QUOTE - INTRODUCTION: AT ITS MARCH 29-30, 1977 MEETING  
IN GENEVA, THE GENEVA GROUP CONSULTATIVE LEVEL DECIDED TO  
CONVENE A MEETING OF EXPERTS FROM THE RESPECTIVE CAPITALS  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 036397

TO REVIEW AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON APPROACH TO BUDGET AND PROGRAM  
ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION, WHICH COULD BE USED IN GENEVA  
GROUP CAPITALS TO FACILITATE EACH COUNTRY'S REVIEW OF THESE  
ORGANIZATIONS' BUDGET AND PROGRAM PROPOSALS. THE EXPERTS  
MEETING, HELD IN GENEVA ON JULY 7-8, 1977, PRODUCED A  
DOCUMENT ENTITLED "STANDARD ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRAM  
BUDGET ANALYSIS," WHICH WAS APPROVED BY THE GENEVA GROUP  
CONSULTATIVE LEVEL AT ITS OCTOBER 6-7, 1977 MEETING IN NEW  
YORK. THE SAF OUTLINES THE COMMON ELEMENTS OF BUDGETARY

ANALYSIS, PROVIDES GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR GENEVA GROUP TECHNICAL REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY BUDGET DOCUMENTS, AND REQUESTS THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL

AND/OR STANDARDIZED BUDGETARY INFORMATION IN ORDER TO FACILITATE NATIONAL REVIEW OF THESE DOCUMENTS. THE EXPERTS, HOWEVER, WERE UNABLE DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS TO ADDRESS THE BROADER AND MORE COMPLEX QUESTION OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND REVIEW AT ITS JULY 1977 MEETING. THE GENEVA GROUP CONSULTATIVE LEVEL THEREFORE AGREED TO CONVEY ON FOLLOW-UP EXPERTS MEETING TO CONSIDER THIS SUBJECT AND, IF POSSIBLE, TO AGREE UPON A COMMON APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS WHICH WOULD COMPLEMENT THE SAF DEVELOPED BY THE EXPERTS AND APPROVED BY THE CONSULTATIVE LEVEL GROUP. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER IS TO PROVIDE A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION AND A POSSIBLE STRUCTURE FOR DEVELOPING SUCH A COMMON APPROACH.

3. PART I DISCUSSES THE PURPOSE OF THE EXERCISE, OUTLINES POSSIBLE CONSTRAINTS AGAINST EFFECTIVE PROGRAM REVIEW OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES, DELINEATES BETWEEN PROGRAM ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND REVIEW, AND ATTEMPTS TO REALISTICALLY DETERMINE WHAT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE EXPECTED OF UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 036397

GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS IN REVIEWING THESE PROGRAMS. PART II OUTLINES THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW, THE VARIOUS METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO PROGRAM REVIEW IN CAPITALS, AND DISCUSSES THE PROCESS OF COORDINATION REQUIRED FOR SUCH REVIEW BOTH WITHIN CAPITALS AND WITHIN THE GENEVA GROUP STRUCTURE. PART III OFFERS RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE GENEVA GROUP MAY WISH TO CONVEY TO THE SECRETARIATS WITH RESPECT TO IMPROVING THEIR OWN PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CAPABILITIES AND, CONSEQUENTLY, FACILITATING GENEVA GROUP PROGRAM REVIEW.

4. ON DEVELOPING A COMMON APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS.

5. I. PURPOSE AND EXPECTATIONS OF A GENEVA GROUP PROGRAM REVIEW EXERCISE.

6. OVER THE COURSE OF THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS, THE GENEVA GROUP HAS BECOME INCREASINGLY AWARE OF THE NEED FOR THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO MAKE A MORE EXERTED AND COORDINATED EFFORT AT REVIEWING THE PROGRAMS OF THE UN SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND RELAYING PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS EMANATING FROM THESE REVIEWS TO THE VARIOUS SECRETARIATS AT AN EARLY STAGE IN THE PROGRAM DECISIONS OF THE SECRETARIATS. BY IMPROVING THE CAPABILITIES OF THE GENEVA GROUP MEMBERS IN REVIEWING SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS, WE WILL BE IN A BETTER POSITION TO:

-- RECOMMEND CHANGES IN PROGRAM EMPHASIS OR DIRECTION WHICH REFLECT OUR COLLECTIVE JUDGMENTS AS TO THE BEST POSSIBLE DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES;

-- IDENTIFY PROGRAMS WHICH HAVE OUTLIVED THEIR USEFULNESS OR ARE OF A LOWER PRIORITY COMPARED TO OTHER DEMANDS ON RESOURCES;

-- INDICATE WHICH PROGRAMS APPEAR TO BE FALLING SHORT OF MEETING STATED OBJECTIVES AND THAT SHOULD BE EVALUATED OR UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 036397

RE-EXAMINED; AND

--IDENTIFY PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE DUPLICATIVE OF OTHER EFFORTS.

7. HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR AT THE BEGINNING THAT EFFECTIVE PROGRAM REVIEW BY THE GENEVA GROUP IS COMPLICATED BY A NUMBER OF FACTORS:

-- PROGRAM ANALYSIS, EVALUATION AND REVIEW REMAIN VERY INEXACT SCIENCES AND NO TRULY OBJECTIVE METHODS OF JUDGING PRIORITIES AMONG PROGRAMS OR EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN DISCOVERED;

-- MOST GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS ARE UNFAMILIAR WITH AN ORGANIZATION'S PROJECTS, SUB-PROGRAM, AND OFTEN EVEN MAJOR PROGRAMS, DUE PRIMARILY TO INADEQUATE DATA AND THE RELATIVE LACK OF EMPHASIS ON ANALYSIS AND REVIEW OF THESE PROGRAMS;

-- THE ORGANIZATIONS HAVE FAILED TO INCORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA INTO THEIR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, MAKING IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR ANALYSTS TO MEASURE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS;

--PROGRAM OBJECTIVES ARE OFTEN DEFINED TOO BROADLY TO BE ABLE TO RELATE PROGRAM ACTIVITY TO THE FULFILLING OF THOSE OBJECTIVES;

-- MOST ORGANIZATIONS' PROGRAMS, WHETHER AT HEADQUARTERS OR IN THE FIELD, ARE FAR REMOVED PHYSICALLY FROM GENEVA GROUP COUNTRIES AND THUS CONSIDERABLE EXPENSE IS INCURRED IN CARRYING OUT EXAMINATIONS OF HEADQUARTERS OPERATIONS OR FIELD EVALUATIONS;

-- POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS, SUCH AS AN UNWILLINGNESS TO APPEAR HOSTILE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES INTERESTS AND DEMANDS, MAY UNDERCUT MUCH HARD ANALYTICAL WORK AND EVENTUALLY MAKE THE EFFORT SEEM WASTED;

--DIFFICULTY WILL BE ENCOUNTERED IN ATTEMPTING TO COORDI- UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 036397

NATE THE REVIEW AMONG THE VARIOUS DOMESTIC AGENCIES IN CAPITALS WHICH HAVE CLIENTELE INTERESTS IN SOME PART OF AN ORGANIZATION'S ACTIVITIES;

-- IT WILL BE DIFFICULT TO DEVELOP A UNIFIED GENEVA GROUP

POSITION OF AN ORGANIZATION'S PROGRAM IN A TIMELY ENOUGH MANNER TO INFLUENCE DECISION-MAKING.

8. THESE FACTOR, HOWEVER, REFLECT THE REALITIES OF OPERATING IN THE MULTILATERAL ARENA AND SHOULD NOT BE VIEWED AS EXCUSES AGAINST ENGAGING IN A PROGRAM REVIEW EXERCISE. RATHER, THESE CONSTRAINTS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

IN DETERMING REALISTICALLY WHAT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE EXPECTED OF ANALYSTS, WHAT TYPE OF "PRODUCT" CAN BE DEVELOPED FROM SUCH A REVIEW, WHAT TYPE OF APPROACH WILL MOST EFFECTIVELY ACHIEVE THE EXPECTED RESULTS, AND HOW THE AGENCIES THEMSELVES CAN IMPROVE THEIR INTERNAL ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION CAPABILITIES AND THUS MAKE OUR TASK LESS DIFFICULT.

9. PROGRAM ANALYSIS VS. PROGRAM EVALUATION VS. PROGRAM REVIEW.

10. BEFORE PROCEEDING TO DISCUSS A COMMON APPROACH TO REVIEWING SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS, IT IS IMPORTANT TO CONCEPTUALLY CLARIFY THESE TERMS SO AS TO PUT US ON COMMON GROUND WHEN DISCUSSING THESE ACTIVITIES.

11. PROGRAM ANALYSIS IS ESSENTIALLY THE SYSTEMATIC, EXPLICIT EXAMINATION OF ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO REACH POLICY OBJECTIVES. IT INCLUDES ASSISTING THE POLICYMAKER IN ESTIMATING THE DESIRABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF DIFFERENT STRATEGIES OF POLICY IMPELEMENTATION, AND INVOLVES ESTIMATING FUTURE COSTS, EFFECTIVENESS, AND ANY OTHER SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE. PROGRAM ANALYSIS IS ESSENTIALLY FOCUSED ON FUTURE ACTIVITIES OF AN ORGANIZATION. UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 036397

ZATION. PROGRAM EVALUATION, ON THE OTHER HAND, ASSESSES THE PAST PERFORMANCE OF EXISTING PROGRAMS IN ACHIEVING THEIR OBJECTIVES AND AIMS AT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT THROUGH A MODIFICATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS. THE FINDINGS OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS PROVIDE IMPORTANT INFORMATION WHICH IS NEEDED FOR PROGRAM ANALYSIS, SINCE PROGRAM ANALYSIS NORMALLY CONSIDERS AN EXISTING PROGRAM TO BE ONE OF THE ALTERNATIVES TO BE EXAMINED. THUS, EVALUATION'S PREOCCUPATION WITH EXISTING PROGRAMS DIFFERS FROM PROGRAM ANALYSIS, WHICH USUALLY COMPARES EXISTING AND HYPOTHETICAL ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM SOLUTIONS TO THE SAME PROBLEM.

12. BOTH PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM EVALUATION USUALLY APPLY TO PROCESSES WITHIN AN ORGANIZATION AS OPPOSED TO INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL PROCESSES. THE PROGRAM ANALYST, IN THIS SENSE, IS ONE WHO IS CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH A PROGRAM AND IS IN A POSITION TO RECOMMEND TO POLICYMAKERS SEVERAL ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION FOR MEETING AN

OBJECTIVE. IN THE SAME SENSE, THE EVALUATOR IS NORMALLY OPERATING FROM WITHIN THE PLANNING AND PROGRAMING STRUCTURE OF THE ORGANIZATION (OR FROM A SYSTEM-WIDE UNIT SUCH AS THE JIU), RELAYING OBSERVATIONS TO THE ANALYST, WHO IN TURN WEIGHS THE CURRENT OPERATION AGAINST OTHER POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES. THUS, IT IS PERHAPS INAPPROPRIATE TO USE THE TERMS "PROGRAM ANALYSIS" AND "PROGRAM

EVALUATION" TO REFER THE PROCESS WE HOPE TO DEVELOP WITHIN THE GENEVA GROUP. SINCE GENEVA GROUP ANALYST ARE ESSENTIALLY ON THE OUTSIDE LOOKING IN -- REACTING TO PROGRAM PROPOSALS RATHER THAN FORMULATING ALTERNATIVES OR WEIGHING PROGRAM OPTIONS -- IT SHOULD BE OBVIOUS THAT WE CANNOT EXPECT TO COMPETE WITH THE INTERNAL ANALYTICAL AND EVALUATION CAPABILITIES OF THE ORGANIZATIONS IN ANY DEGREE OF UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 036397

PROGRAM DETAIL, SHORT OF CHALLENGING A SELECTED FEW ACTIVITIES. IN ESSENCE, WE NEED A MORE DESCRIPTIVE WORD TO USE IN REFERRING TO OUR EXTERNAL PROCESS.

13. THE WORK "REVIEW" MORE ACCURATELY DESCRIBES A PROCESS WHICH CAN BE DEVELOPED WITHIN CAPITALS AND REFINED TO WHATEVER LEVEL OF SOPHISTICATION DEEMED DESIRABLE WITHIN THE CAPABILITIES OF THE RESPECTIVE GENEVA GROUP COUNTRIES. REVIEW IMPLIES A BROADER EXAMINATION OF WHERE AN ORGANIZATION IS AT A PARTICULAR TIME AND WHERE IT SHOULD BE GOING, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF LOOKING AT IT FROM THE OUTSIDE AND THE IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO THE ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE AND TO SPECIFIC PROGRAM EMPHASES OF THE ORGANIZATION. REVIEW ALSO IMPLIES A LESS ANALYTICAL, LESS OBJECTIVE PROCESS THAN PROGRAM ANALYSIS OR EVALUATION, ALTHOUGH THE ELEMENTS OF THESE PROCESSES WILL CERTAINLY BE APPLIED TO SOME EXTENT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS. THIS IS NOT BAD IN AND OF ITSELF -- IT IS MERELY A REALIZATION THAT OUR CAPABILITIES, AT LEAST IN THE NEAR TERM, ARE LIMITED, AND IT FURTHER CALLS INTO QUESTION WHETHER IT IS THE APPROPRIATE ROLE OF MEMBER STATES TO PERFORM THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARIATS. FURTHERMORE, BY AVOIDING THE USE OF THE WORD "EVALUATION" IN REFERRING TO OUR PROCESS, WE WILL BE ABLE TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT AS IT ATTEMPTS TO STRENGTHEN ITS ROLE IN UN-SYSTEM-WIDE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.

14. REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS

15. SINCE THIS PAPER HAS ALREADY ASSERTED THAT A NUMBER OF FACTORS CONSTRAIN THE REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS, AND THAT SUCH A REVIEW COULD IN NO WAY COMPETE WITH THE INTERNAL PROCESS OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION WITHIN THE ORGANIZATIONS, A VALID QUESTION BECOMES WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT OR NOT EXPECT FROM THIS EXERCISE"?

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 036397

16. BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO ANSWER THE QUESTION DIRECTLY, TWO ASSUMPTIONS SHOULD BE TABLED:  
-- ALTHOUGH MANPOWER AND RESOURCE CAPABILITIES VARY AMONG GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENTS, THERE MUST BE SOME MINIMUM STANDARD OF PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITY PERFORMED BY EACH GOVERNMENT IS THE UNIFIED APPROACH IS TO SUCCEED.

-- LIKE ANY NEW PROCESS, EXPECTATIONS SHOULD NOT BE SET TOO HIGH IN THE FIRST YEARS. PERHAPS GOVERNMENTS COULD AGREE TO PERFORM PRIORITY RANKINGS OF PROGRAMS IN THE FIRST YEAR, AND THEN ATTEMPT TREND ANALYSIS OR INPUT/OUTPUT OR OTHER MORE REFINED ANALYSES IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS. THIS, OF COURSE, IS CONTINGENT UPON THE ABILITY OF EACH GOVERNMENT TO DEVELOP AN INTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS WHICH CAN DEVELOP MORE ANALYTICAL EXPERTISE OVER TIME.

17. IN GENERAL, REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCH AN EXERCISE WOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- (1) EACH GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE ABLE TO DEVELOP AN INTERNAL PROCESS (OR IMPROVE AN EXISTING PROCESS) FOR THE TIMELY REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS.
  - (2) GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS SHOULD BE CAPABLE OF PROVIDING IN A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME A PRIORITY RANKING OF MAJOR PROGRAMS, AND PERHAPS A RANKING OF SUB-PROGRAMS WITHIN EACH PROGRAM.
  - (3) GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY PROGRAMS WHICH RAISE DOUBT AS TO THEIR CONTINUED USEFULNESS, MARGINAL BENEFIT, OR VALUE AS PERCEIVED BY THE GOVERNMENTS.
  - (4) THE GENEVA GROUP SHOULD BE ABLE TO AGREE UPON SOME GENERAL PROGRAM DIRECTIONS STEMMING FROM THE PRIORITY RANKING PROCESS, AND TO AGREE ON THOSE ACTIVITIES WHICH
- UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 036397

SHOULD BE RE-EXAMINED OR EVALUATED, EITHER BY THE GENEVA GROUP OR THE JIU.

- (5) THE INTERNAL AND GENEVA GROUP PROCESSES SHOULD BE ABLE TO BE DEVELOPED WITHIN A TIMEFRAME WHICH ALLOWS RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE PASSED ON TO THE SECRETARIATS AT AN EARLY STAGE IN THEIR PROGRAM AND BUDGET CYCLES.
- (6) GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DEVOTE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AS NEEDED TO CARRY OUT EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED PROGRAMS IDENTIFIED IN THE REVIEW PROCESS.
- (7) EVALUATIONS SHOULD BE IN A FORM WHICH CAN BE PASSED ALONG TO OTHER GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENTS AND TO THE SECRETARIATS.

18. UNREASONABLE EXPECTATIONS WOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- (1) PROGRAM REVIEWS IN CAPITALS SHOULD NOT BE FOCUSED IN SUCH DETAIL SO AS TO CLOG THE PROCESS WITH UNNECESSARY REVIEW. FURTHERMORE, THE VALUE OF SUCH DETAILED REVIEW IS OF MARGINAL BENEFIT UNLESS THE GENEVA GROUP CAN SYNTHESIZE AND AGREE UPON SPECIFIC PROGRAMMATIC DETAILS (WHICH IS UNLIKELY IN THE NEAR FUTURE).
- (2) PROGRAM REVIEWS PROBABLY CANNOT BE BACKED UP WITH ANY APPRECIABLE DEGREE OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS, SINCE GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS WILL HAVE INADEQUATE DATA FROM WHICH TO WORK IN

THE FIRST PLACE. THIS WILL REPRESENT SOMEWHAT OF A PROBLEM WHEN PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS ARE PASSED ON TO THE SECRETARIATS, WHO ASK FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMMATIC DETAILS KNOWING FULL WELL THAT OUR ABILITIES TO PRODUCE SUCH DETAILS ARE LIMITED.

- (3) COORDINATION OF PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS AMONG THE GENEVA GROUP BECOMES MORE DIFFICULT IN PROPORTION TO THE AMOUNT OF PROGRAM DETAIL GENERATED BY INTERNAL REVIEWS, AS STATED ABOVE. TO EXPECT A UNIFIED GENEVA GROUP "POSITION" TO DEVELOP IN THE INITIAL ATTEMPT IS PERHAPS UNREALISTIC, ALTHOUGH THE BENEFITS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROCESS WILL BE WORTHWHILE.
- UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 036397

19. PART II OF THIS PAPER ATTEMPTS TO DEVELOP A COMMON APPROACH TO PROGRAM REVIEW BASED UPON THESE EXPECTATIONS AND LIMITATIONS.

20. II. COMMON APPROACH TO THE REVIEW OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS.

21. THIS SECTION ELUCIDATES THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW AND RELATED THEM TO SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS, OUTLINES VARIOUS METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO PROGRAM REVIEW IN CAPITALS, AND DISCUSSES THE PROCESS OF COORDINATION REQUIRED FOR SUCH REVIEW BOTH WITHIN CAPITALS AND AMONG THE RESPECTIVE GENEVA GROUP COUNTRIES.

22. BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW

23. THE FOLLOWING SERIES OF QUESTIONS INCORPORATE THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW:

- WHAT IS THE PROBLEM? WHAT ARE THE CAUSES? TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THEY KNOWN? WHAT CLIENT GROUPS ARE AFFECTED. WHAT IS THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM?
- TOWARD WHAT OBJECTIVES SHOULD PROGRAMS FOR MEETING THE PROBLEM BE DIRECTED, I.E., FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES?
- ARE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES WELL-DEFINED? ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF ON-GOING PROGRAMS STILL VALID?
- HOW LONG HAS THE PROGRAM BEEN UNDERWAY? WHEN WAS IT

LAST REVIEWED BY A POLICYMAKING ORGAN? WHEN IS IT EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED?

-- WHAT EVALUATION CRITERIA ARE BUILT INTO THE PROGRAM? SHORT OF THESE CRITERIA, HOW CAN ESTIMATES OF PROGRESS AGAINST OBJECTIVES BE MADE.

-- WHAT OTHER AGENCIES ARE ATTEMPTING TO MEET THE PROBLEM?  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 11 STATE 036397

IS THERE DUPLICATION OF EFFORT WITH THESE AGENCIES?

-- WHAT IS THE DEGREE OF POLITICAL SUPPORT BEHIND THE PROGRAM?

-- WHAT ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE

CONSIDERED?

24. ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS SHOULD ENABLE THE ANALYST TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION OF FOUR CATEGORIES OF CRITERIA BY WHICH THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF A PROGRAM MAY BE JUDGED:

(1) EFFORT -- THIS IS AN ASSESSMENT OF INPUT OR WORKLOAD WITHOUT REGARD TO OUTPUT. HERE THE CRITERION OF SUCCESS IS THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF ACTIVITY THAT TAKES PLACE.

(2) EFFECTIVENESS -- THIS IS A PERFORMANCE CRITERION MEASURING THE RESULTS OF EFFORT RATHER THAN THE EFFORT ITSELF AND REQUIRES A CLEAR STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES.

(3) IMPACT -- HERE THE CRITERION OF SUCCESS IS THE DEGREE TO WHICH EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE IS ADEQUATE TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF NEED.

(4) COST EFFECTIVENESS -- THIS CRITERION REPRESENTS A RATIO BETWEEN EFFORT AND IMPACT AND ASKS WHETHER THE COST IS JUSTIFIED BY THE IMPACT MADE BY THE PROGRAM.

25. THESE CRITERIA WILL BE DISCUSSED MORE EXPLICITLY IN THE FOLLOWING SECTION RELATING TO THE NATURE OF THE PROGRAMS TO BE REVIEWED.

26. THE NATURE OF SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS.

27. APPROXIMATELY 70% OF THE REGULAR BUDGETS OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES ARE COMPRISED OF PERSONNEL COSTS. THUS, AGENCY REGULAR "PROGRAMS" ESSENTIALLY INCLUDE STUDIES, MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES, COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF STATISTICS AND INFORMATION, AND RELATED BUREAUCRATIC ACTIVITIES. IN MANY CASES, HOWEVER, THE MAJOR  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 12 STATE 036397

PROGRAM IS A COMBINATION OF REGULAR BUDGET AND EXTRA-BUDGETARY ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE DIFFICULT TO DISTINGUISH IN THE NARRATIVE SECTIONS OF THE PROGRAM BUDGET DOCUMENTS. IT IS THUS DIFFICULT FOR THE REVIEWER TO DETERMINE THE



ADEQUACY OF REGULAR PROGRAMMATIC INPUTS AND THE IMPACT OF THOSE RESOURCES IN FULFILLING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES. BUT THE REAL QUESTION REMAINS, HOW SHOULD THE REVIEWER PROCEED?

28. FIRST, THE REVIEWER MUST ASK, TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY, WHETHER THE EFFORT IS WORTHWHILE. GIVEN THE MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEMS FACED AND THE GROWING REALIZATIONS OF RESOURCE LIMITATIONS, THE QUESTION BECOMES FAIR, BOTH INTELLECTUALLY AND IN PRACTICAL TERMS. OF COURSE, THIS REPRESENTS THE MOST COMPLEX QUESTION ASKED IN THE REALM OF PUBLIC POLICY, AND THE ANSWER CAN ONLY BE SUBJECTIVE. THE USUAL RESPONSE OF POLICYMAKERS IS TO THROW A COMPARATIVELY SMALL AMOUNT OF RESOURCES AT A WIDE VARIETY OF

PROBLEMS, RATHER THAN FOCUSING IN ON THE MOST CRITICAL ONES. THIS PHENOMENON IS EVEN GREATER IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, WHERE SECRETARIATS HAVE LESS LATITUDE IN DETERMINING THE PRIORTIZATION OF PROGRAMS. BUT SHORT OF ASKING THE ORGANIZATIONS TO CUT BACK PROGRAMS BY A CERTAIN AMOUNT WITHOUT PROVIDING ANY RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO WHERE THE REDUCTIONS WOULD BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE, THIS QUESTION OF APPROPRIATE EFFORT MUST BE ADDRESSED.

29. SECOND, THE REVIEWER MUST MAKE AN ATTEMPT TO JUDGE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PROGRAM, OR AT LEAST TO CONCLUDE THAT THE EFFECTIVENESS MAY BE LESS THAN OPTIMAL. THIS IS ATTEMPTED BY LAYING OUT THE OBJECTIVES AND MATCHING THE PROGRAM INPUTS AGAINST THE OBJECTIVES. THIS IS DIFFICULT WITHOUT SOME TYPE OF EVALUATION MECHANISM, BUT THE TASK UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 13 STATE 036397

CAN BE MADE EASIER BY THE INCORPORATION OF PERFORMANCE CRITERIA INTO THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM.

30. THIRD, THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMS MUST BE SCRUTINIZED. A PROGRAM MAY BE WELL CONCEIVED AND EFFECTIVE IN MEETING ITS OBJECTIVES, BUT MAY MAKE ONLY A SLIGHT CONTRIBUTION RELATIVE TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF NEED. A LARGER POPULATION MAY BE SERVED BY APPLYING THE RESOURCES IN A DIFFERENT FASHION.

31. FOURTH, COST HAS TO BE A CRITICAL ELEMENT IN ANY REVIEW. DETERMINING THE COST EFFECTIVENESS OF A SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAM WILL ALSO BE DIFFICULT, SINCE QUANTIFIABLE MEASUREMENTS OF BENEFITS SELDOM EXIST. ONCE AGAIN, SUBJECTIVE JUDGMENTS WILL HAVE TO BE RELIED UPON. IF THE IMPACT IS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN THE RELATIVE COST, THIS JUDGMENT SHOULD BE MADE KNOWN TO THE GENEVA GROUP AND THE SECRETARIATS.

32. OBVIOUSLY THE FOREGOING DISCUSSION IS "BOILERPLATE" AND CAN BE FOUND IN ALMOST EVERY TEXTBOOK ON PROGRAM

ANALYSIS OR PUBLIC POLICY DEVELOPMENT. THE POINT THAT SHOULD BE MADE IS THAT ONCE A PROCESS GETS UNDERWAY -- ONCE GENEVA GROUP ANALYSTS AND REPRESENTATIVES BEGIN TO LOOK SERIOUSLY AT THE PROGRAMS OF THESE AGENCIES -- THESE GENERAL QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA WILL BRING TO LIGHT A NUMBER OF SUBJECTIVE JUDGMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS WHICH CAN BE ADDRESSED COLLECTIVELY BY THE GENEVA GROUP.

33. VARIOUS METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAM REVIEW.

34. AS MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY, THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GENEVA GROUP REVIEW PROCESS MUST BEGIN WITH A RELATIVELY SIMPLE

REFINED AS THE GENEVA GROUP DESIRES. KEEPING IN MIND  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 14 STATE 036397

OUR EARLIER DISCUSSIONS, THIS SECTION PROPOSES THREE METHODOLOGIES, IN THE ORDER OF THEIR PROBABLE EVOLUTION, WHICH COULD BE UTILIZED AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE IN GENEVA GROUP CAPITALS.

(1) PRIORITY RANKING -- THE SIMPLEST FORM OF PROGRAM REVIEW INVOLVES THE RANK ORDERING OF THE VARIOUS AGENCY PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO EACH MEMBER GOVERNMENT'S PERCEPTION OF THEIR IMPORTANCE RELATIVE TO OTHER PROGRAMS CARRIED OUT BY THE AGENCY. PRIORITY RANKING AT THE SUB-PROGRAM LEVEL (PROBABLY THE MOST VALID IN THE EARLY STAGES OF THE GENEVA GROUP PROCESS) SHOULD NOT REPRESENT MAJOR DIFFICULTIES, BECAUSE (A) MOST SPECIALIZED AGENCY BUDGET DOCUMENTS ARE DEVELOPED ALONG THESE LINES, AND (B) THE MINISTRIES SHOULD BE ABLE TO PRIORITIZE AMONG ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN THE SAME NARROW SECTOR. FOR EXAMPLE, FAO'S PROGRAM OF FISHERIES EXPLOITATION AND UTILIZATION IS COMPOSED OF SIX SUBPROGRAMS: MARINE RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, INLAND WATER RESOURCES, FISH PRODUCTION, FISH UTILIZATION, REGIONAL OFFICES, AND FIELD PROGRAM. A CAREFUL READING OF THE BUDGET DOCUMENTS, AS WELL AS OTHER INFORMATION GAINED THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES RELATING TO THE VARIOUS SUBPROGRAMS, SHOULD PROVIDE AN INDICATION, ALBEIT SKETCHY, OF WHAT THE ORGANIZATION IS DOING IN THIS PROGRAM AREA. CONCLUSIONS CAN THEN BE REACHED AMONG THE EXPERTS IN CAPITALS AS TO THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EACH SUBPROGRAM IN THE AREA OF FISHERIES EXPLOITATION AND UTILIZATION. PRIORITY RANKING BECOMES MORE DIFFICULT AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL, WHERE FISHERIES IS RANKED AGAINST FORESTRY OR AGRICULTURE. BUT THE IMPORTANT POINT TO BE MADE HERE IS THAT SUCH RANKING, REGARDLESS OF THE DEGREE OF SUBJECTIVITY USED, IS A REALISTIC STARTING POINT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GENEVA GROUP PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS. SUCH A METHODOLOGY WOULD  
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 15 STATE 036397

ENABLE GOVERNMENTS TO IDENTIFY THEIR PRIORITIES REGARDING AN ORGANIZATION'S PROGRAM MIX, TO MAKE GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE LEVEL OF RESOURCES DEEMED ADEQUATE TO CARRY OUT THE PROGRAMS, AND PERHAPS EVEN TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PHASING DOWN LOWER PRIORITY ACTIVITIES. THE BEAUTY OF THE PROCESS IS THAT WHILE IT REQUIRES SOME SOUL-SEARCHING AND THE ASKING OF FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS BY EACH GOVERNMENT, IT DOES NOT NECESSARILY REQUIRE AN ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM INPUTS OR OUTPUTS.

(2) TREND ANALYSIS -- ANOTHER FORM OF PROGRAM REVIEW, TREND ANALYSIS, COMPLEMENTS AND GOES BEYOND THE PRIORITY RANKING METHOD BY EXAMINING THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF PROGRAM INPUTS AND THEN EXTRAPOLATING INTO THE FUTURE THE APPROPRIATE DIRECTIONS AND RESOURCE LEVELS OF THE

PROGRAMS. TREND ANALYSIS IDENTIFIES PROGRAM MOVEMENTS OR DIRECTION, AND TASKS THE ANALYST TO ASK IF THIS IS THE DIRECTION WHICH HIS GOVERNMENT BELIEVES TO BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE. THIS METHODOLOGY ENTAILS A FAIRLY RIGOROUS RE-EXAMINATION OF PAST PROGRAM AND BUDGET DOCUMENTS IN ORDER TO TRACE THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS AND SUBPROGRAMS AND TO SEE IF THE OBJECTIVES ARE STATED DIFFERENTLY OR IF THE PROGRAM EMPHASIS HAS CHANGED. IT ALSO TAKES ACCOUNT OF OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE TRENDS. TREND ANALYSIS IS MORE OBJECTIVE THAN PRIORITY RANKING, BUT ITS INFERENCE THAT INPUTS ARE PROVIDING THE EXPECTED OUTPUTS IS NOT ALWAYS VALID . . . FOR EXAMPLE, THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS WITH GRADUATE DEGREES OR THE RATION OF LIBRARY BOOKS TO STUDENTS DOES NOT ALWAYS COINCIDE WITH THE AMOUNT OF KNOWLEDGE PASSED ON TO STUDENTS. HOWEVER, SHORT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING OR PROGRAM EVALUATION, TREND ANALYSIS PROVIDES THE BEST WAY OF LOOKING AT A PROGRAM IN THE CONTEXT OF WHERE IT HAS BEEN, WHERE IT IS NOW, AND WHERE IT SHOULD BE GOING.

(3) INPUT/OUTPUT ANALYSIS -- THIS METHODOLOGY INVOLVES THE REVIEW OF PROGRAMS THROUGH THE USE OF COST ANALYSIS, UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 16 STATE 036397

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS, AND OTHER MEASUREMENTS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS. IT REQUIRES A GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF SPECIFIC RESOURCE INPUTS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE OUTPUT CRITERIA. THUS, IT REQUIRES MUCH MORE AVAILABILITY TO DATA THAN CURRENTLY PROVIDED AND SIGNIFICANT MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS TO BE EFFECTIVE. THIS METHODOLOGY CAN AND SHOULD BE UTILIZED TO REVIEW PROGRAMS WHICH, THROUGH OTHER APPROACHES, HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS POSSIBLY INEFFECTIVE OR OF MARGINAL BENEFIT. HOWEVER, THESE EVALUATIONS WILL OUT OF NECESSITY HAVE TO BE LIMITED IN NUMBER AND SCOPE. SEPARATE PAPERS ON THE TECHNIQUES OF PROGRAM EVALUATION ARE BEING DEVELOPED.

35. THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS IN CAPITALS.

36. THE GROUP OF EXPERTS MAY WISH TO MAKE SEVERAL GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF INTERNAL REVIEW WITHIN GENEVA GROUP CAPITALS.

37. FIRST, IT IS IMPORTANT FOR EACH GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENT TO DEVELOP THE INTERNAL CAPABILITY, OR IMPROVE UPON AN EXISTING CAPABILITY, TO ENGAGE IN A PROCESS OF REVIEW WHICH PROVIDES THAT GOVERNMENT'S TIMELY INPUT INTO THE PROCESS AGREED UPON BY THE GENEVA GROUP. THE UNITED STATES, FOR EXAMPLE, HAS RECENTLY ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE A POLICY MANAGEMENT STAFF FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, WHICH WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING U.S. POLICY OBJECTIVES IN EACH ORGANIZATION,

RELATING THESE OBJECTIVES TO RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS, IDENTIFYING PROGRAMATIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES NECESSARY FOR MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT OPERATION, AND EVALUATING THE WORK OF THE ORGANIZATIONS IN RELATION TO UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 17 STATE 036397

OBJECTIVES. THE REVIEW PROCESS DEVELOPED BY THIS STAFF WILL BE HELPFUL IN IDENTIFYING U.S. PRIORITIES AS WELL AS PINPOINTING PROGRAMS WHICH ARE OF MARGINAL BENEFIT OR OBSOLETE, AND WILL SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR DEVELOPING THE U.S. POSITIONS ON PROGRAMS WITHIN THE GENEVA GROUP.

38. SECOND, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE INTERNAL REVIEW OF PROGRAMS IN CAPITALS RELY HEAVILY ON SUBSTANTIVE INPUTS FROM THE TECHNICAL EXPERTS IN THE RESPECTIVE MINISTRIES OR DEPARTMENTS. THE FOREIGN MINISTRIES ARE LIMITED IN THEIR SUBSTANTIVE CAPABILITIES TO ANALYZE PROGRAMS IN A WIDE VARIETY OF SECTORS, AND WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO RANK PROGRAM PRIORITIES WITH THE EASE OF THE TECHNICAL DEPARTMENTS.

39. COORDINATION WITHIN THE GENEVA GROUP.

40. THE REMAINING QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED IS HOW THE RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL REVIEWS WILL BE PULLED TOGETHER INTO A GENEVA GROUP "POSITION" WHICH CAN BE PRESENTED TO THE SECRETARIATS.

41. MUCH OF THE COORDINATION AND DISCUSSION MUST BE CARRIED OUT AT THE GENEVA GROUP LOCAL LEVEL. THESE INDIVIDUALS ARE THE ONES MOST CLOSELY INVOLVED WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS AND CAN NEGOTIATE AMONG THEMSELVES MORE FREQUENTLY THAN THE OTHER GENEVA GROUP LEVELS. THE LOCAL GROUPS SHOULD PROVIDE FEEDBACK TO CAPITALS AND TO THE GENEVA GROUP GENERAL ON ISSUES RAISED DURING THESE DIS-

CUSSIONS.

42. THE GENEVA GROUP GENERAL SHOULD BE THE FOCAL POINT OF THE PROCESS. RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED FROM THE LOCAL GROUPS SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED BY THIS GROUP. SINCE THE CONSULTATIVE LEVEL MEETS ONLY TWICE A YEAR, ITS INVOLVEMENT WILL BE LITTLE MORE THAN APPROVING THE UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 18 STATE 036397

RECOMMENDATIONS DEVELOPED AT THE LOCAL AND GENERAL LEVELS.

43. IT WAS MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY THAT THE TASK OF COORDINATING THE VARIOUS REVIEWS MAY NOT BE DIFFICULT IF THE LEVEL OF PROGRAMMATIC DETAIL IS KEPT WITHIN REASON, ESPECIALLY DURING THE FIRST SEVERAL REVIEWS. PAST ATTEMPTS TO DEVELOP A CONSENSUS APPROACH TO SPECIFIC PROPOSALS AMONG GENEVA GROUP COUNTRIES HAVE MET WITH BOTH SUCCESS AND FAILURE. IT IS DIFFICULT TO SPECULATE ON

THE PROSPECTS PRIOR TO THE FIRST ATTEMPT. HOWEVER, THE FAILURE TO REACH A CONSENSUS AMONG THE GROUP SHOULD NOT DETER GOVERNMENTS FROM PASSING THEIR RESPECTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS ON TO THE SECRETARIATS, EITHER UNILATERALLY OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER GENEVA GROUP GOVERNMENTS.

44. RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE SPECIALIZED AGENCY PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING.

45. THE GROUP OF EXPERTS MAY WISH TO RECOMMEND SEVERAL ACTIONS WHICH WOULD IMPROVE THE PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING CAPABILITIES OF THE AGENCIES AND ENHANCE THE GENEVA GROUP REVIEW OF THESE PROGRAMS:

- (1) CLEARER SPECIFICATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES -- OFTEN-TIMES THE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES INCLUDED IN PROGRAM AND BUDGET DOCUMENTS ARE SO VAGUE AND NON-SPECIFIC THAT VIRTUALLY ANY PROGRAM COULD BE CONSTRUED AS FULFILLING, TO SOME DEGREE, THE STATED OBJECTIVE. ONCE OBJECTIVES ARE THIGHTENED UP, MARGINAL PROGRAMS WILL BE EASIER TO IDENTIFY.
  - (2) INCORPORATION OF REALISTIC EVALUATION CRITERIA INTO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT -- SPECIALIZED AGENCY PROGRAMS SHOULD INCLUDE IDENTIFIABLE EVALUATION CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMS CAN BE JUDGED.
- UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 19 STATE 036397

- (3) STRENGTHENING OF CURRENT EVALUATION CAPABILITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES -- EVALUATION IS JUST BEGINNING TO CATCH ON IN THE AGENCIES. THEY SHOULD BE REQUESTED TO PLACE INCREASED EMPHASIS ON PROGRAM EVALUATION.
- (4) GREATER UTILIZATION OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT -- THE JIU SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED SO AS TO IMPROVE ITS

CAPABILITIES IN CARRYING OUT EVALUATIONS AND ITS ABILITY  
TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO THE AGENCIES IN DEVELOPING THEIR  
INTERNAL EVALUATION CAPABILITIES. UNQUOTE.

46. FOR GENEVA: FOREGOING IS UNCLEARED PAPER FOR DIS-  
CUSSION BY GENEVA GROUP AT FEBRUARY 23-24 MEETING IF U.S.  
MISSION GENEVA DEEMS IT USEFUL. UNITED STATES DELEGATION  
SHOULD RESERVE RIGHT TO COMMENT POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY  
UPON PAPER AT THAT TIME OR SUBSEQUENTLY. VANCE

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 26 sep 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 10 feb 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** n/a  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:**  
**Disposition Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978STATE036397  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** IO/IBC/BA:WMSOUTHWORTH:MZ  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780063-1104  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t197802120/baaafbx.tel  
**Line Count:** 715  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** b99cb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN IO  
**Original Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 14  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** GENEVA 720  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 29 mar 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** N/A  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3475354  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** GENEVA GROUP - MEETING OF EXPERTS ON PROGRAM ANALYSIS  
**TAGS:** AORG  
**To:** GENEVA INFO PARIS MULTIPLE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/b99cb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014